From: Solomon, Harry (GE Healthcare) [Harry.Solomon@med.ge.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2008 9:48 AM
To: Tip
Cc: Randy Blankenhorn; Gordon Smith; hmorgan@cmap.iilinois.gov; Stauber, Joel; aalex@uic.edu
Subject: Comments on RTP Update and TIP amendments

1. The Draft Revision of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan should recognize some of the new regional priorities and the new realities of the high fuel price economy. Even though this is only a relatively minor update to the RTP, and understandably not much effort is being put into it, it should at least introduce the overarching themes of *Sustainability, Equity* and *Innovation* accepted by the CMAP Board for the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. For example, the "Regional Transportation Challenges and Concerns" should, under Section 1.2.6 Natural Environment at least mention the regional goal of applying sustainability principles, not just to the regional environment, but to the larger scope of the global environment and in particular climate change, and our goal of substantially reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Section 1.4.3.1 Transportation and Natural Environment Objectives should address overall carbon footprint *reduction*, not just "offsetting carbon emissions."

2. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments, as listed in "Results for conformity analysis of October 9, 2008 TIP Amendment", include an item "I-294 at Balmoral TIP ID: 05-08-0013 – new project." However, I could not find this project in the "FY 2007-2012 Project Listing Current as of the August 22, 2008 CMAP Transportation Committee meeting" file on the CMAP website, and 05-08-0013 in that file is the ID for a completely different project ("31st Street from Kemman Avenue …"). The other two new projects, "Add lanes to Reagan Memorial Tollway …TIP ID: 09-08-0034" and "River Road and Chapel Hill Road …TIP ID 11-08-0023" also do not appear in the TIP Project Listing file. ***It is impossible to comment on the TIP amendments if there are no details on the new projects.*** It is essential that the materials provide a complete and consistent accounting of the TIP projects.

3. As a general comment, the TIP amendments review process does not come up to the standards of CMAP's Public Participation Plan. The material is presented in a manner that there is no effective way for the public to participate in a meaningful review. I have served two years on the CMAP Citizens' Advisory Committee, I consider myself fairly knowledgeable about planning documents and pretty computer-savvy, but I had considerable difficulty understanding what is really in the update, and finding it on the CMAP website. For instance, the updates are listed in a memo entitled "Results for conformity analysis of October 9, 2008 TIP Amendment", and it is not apparent that that really is the list of TIP projects being changed (and not a misdirected Web link), or what the list means, or the content and significance of the projects in the list. In my search for details on the TIP projects, I even downloaded the MS Access database of projects; the user interface is wholly unusable for the process of public review (even assuming they have MS Access software and the skills necessary to use it), and the database doesn't really have descriptions of the projects anyway. I recognize that improving the web site and visualization tools is a work in process, but effective and meaningful *public* review (not just by project programmers and planning professionals) is critical to CMAP accountability. Even a little bit of attention to considering the questions the public would ask about the TIP, and reformatting the data for presentation to address those questions, would go a long way to improving usability.

- Harry Solomon
CMAP Citizens' Advisory Committee